



**National Park Service  
Gateway National Recreation Area  
Sandy Hook Unit  
County of Monmouth  
Sandy Hook, New Jersey 07732**

---

**Section 106 Case Report**

**Fort Hancock and Sandy Hook Proving Ground Historic District,  
Rehabilitation of Thirty-Six Landmark Buildings**

**Address of Property**

**Gateway National Recreation Area, Sandy Hook Unit  
58 Magruder Road  
P. O. Box 530  
Fort Hancock, New Jersey 07732**

**Contact: Superintendent Richard E. Wells  
Phone: 732-872-5913**

**October 2004**

## 1. Description of the Undertaking

The National Park Service proposes to rehabilitate and adaptively use thirty-six (36) nationally significant historic buildings in the Fort Hancock and the Sandy Hook Proving Ground Historic District (District).

The Fort Hancock “campus” is comprised of approximately one hundred (100) buildings. Beyond the thirty-six (36) buildings considered in this undertaking, one building will be leased to its current tenant, the American Littoral Society. Twenty (20) of the 100 buildings are currently used by existing park partners. The remaining buildings will be maintained and rehabilitated as necessary for visitor use and park related management operations.

The project has undergone an extensive environmental analysis and public involvement process. The *Adaptive Use of Fort Hancock and the Sandy Hook Proving Ground Environmental Assessment* (EA) was made available February 13, 2002 for a 120 day public review period. Copies of the EA were distributed to park partners and various regulatory agencies. The required public notices were issued and the EA was placed at local libraries and posted on the Internet for inspection. The public comment period on the EA closed on June 15, 2002.

In 2002, the park hosted four public open houses to provide information on the project and obtain input from the public. The open houses were held on February 28, March 2, April 20 and June 1. Members of the park staff were available to discuss the project, answer questions and receive public comment. Approximately 1,200 individuals attended the open houses. In addition, public meetings were held on April 20 and June 1. The public meetings provided an opportunity for the public to provide oral comments. The meetings were documented on audiotape, transcripts from which are posted on the park’s website.

A supplementary Traffic Study was initiated on November 1, 2002. Again, the Traffic Study was widely distributed for public review in the same manner as the EA. A forty-five day public review period began on March 15, 2003 and concluded on April 30, 2003. A public meeting was held on April 12, 2003 where the public provided oral comments, which were audio taped and transcribed.

There has been considerable review and consultation with the office of the NJ State Historic Preservation Officer (NJSHPO). The NJSHPO commented on A.D.A. access to Officers Row Houses in December 1997; concurred in the Fort Hancock Rehabilitation Guidelines in December 1998; participated in a walk through and discussion of Alternatives and Effects in November, 2000; participated in informal workshops/site walk through with staff from the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) on January 8 and 9, 2001; participated in an April 20, 2002 public meeting on the EA; attended the June 1, 2002 public meeting on the EA; provided written comments on the EA on June 14, 2002; provided Section 106 comments on the Traffic Study (May 6, 2003) determining “No Adverse Effect,” participated in a meeting to discuss specific treatment options on December 19, 2003; and attended the Public Forum on September 18, 2004.

In conjunction with and as part of the continuing conversation with NJSHPO, a draft Programmatic Agreement was prepared. The draft PA was released for public comment on April 30, 2004. The comment period closed on June 3, 2004.

## **2. Steps Taken to Identify Historic Properties in the National Historic Landmark District**

The Fort Hancock/Sandy Hook Proving Ground National Historic District is located within the boundaries of the park known as Gateway National Recreation Area, Sandy Hook. It is bounded by the Atlantic Ocean to the east, the Route 36 Bridge to the south, the Sandy Hook Bay to the west and Lower New York Harbor to the north. With the exception of Skeleton Hill Island, and South Island, the entire Sandy Hook peninsula is within the district. Within the district, the Fort Hancock zone includes structures north of Guardian Park, the park itself, and the Sandy Hook Proving Ground zone from in front of Nine Gun Battery south to the Generator Building near Battery Gunnison. The district also includes the Sandy Hook Coast Guard Station. The district's National Register status has evolved over time.

Three other properties in the park are individually listed on the National Register, the Sandy Hook Lighthouse (NHL), the Spermaceti Cove Life-Saving Station, and the Cove House Historic District.

The following is a list of Sandy Hook historic property National Register designations.

- 1. Sandy Hook Light (National Historic Landmark):**  
(Entered 01/29/64, NR Ref # 66000468)
- 2. Fort Hancock and the Sandy Hook Proving Ground Historic District:**  
(Entered 04/24/80, NR Ref # 80002505)
- 3. The Spermaceti Cove No. 2 Life-Saving Service Station:**  
(Entered 11/30/81, NR Ref # 81000080)
- 4. Fort Hancock and the Sandy Hook Proving Ground Historic District (National Historic Landmark):**  
(Entered 12/17/82, NR Ref # 8002505)
- 5. Cove House National Historic District:**  
(Entered 06/28/98, NR Ref # 28-MO-161)

**NHL Nomination/Year/Status:** The nomination that created the Fort Hancock and Sandy Hook Proving Ground NHL in 1982 identifies two important and very different stories associated with the cultural resources of the District. The first story is that of the Sandy Hook Proving Ground where the nation's weaponry was tested from 1874 to 1919. The second is the story of Fort Hancock as a military coastal defense post to protect New York Harbor from 1895 to 1974. The 36 buildings in this proposal are part of both phases of significance.

The buildings served as mess halls, barracks, the Post Exchange, captains and lieutenant's quarters, chapel, theater, warehouses and other uses.

The Landmark District was included on the *Secretary of the Interior's List of Most Threatened National Historic Landmarks* as of 1998 because of general decline and lack of NPS funds to rehabilitate them following the Secretary's Standards. The 36 buildings will be rehabilitated through the proposed project, which will lead to their preservation instead of their gradual decline.

## ***Cultural Landscape***

Two cultural landscape assessments in 1994 and 1999 conclude that the project area retains a high level of historical integrity in spatial organization, circulation patterns, views and vistas, historic structures, vegetation and small scale features.

## ***Archeology***

Years of archeological evaluation, testing preceding various construction projects, and unexpected finds during construction have established that the archeological record of Sandy Hook is highly varied in terms of its cultural association, location, nearness to ground surface, degree of preservation, and significance.

Two factors are important when considering the potential for archeological sites in the comprehensive area of potential effect. One is the effect of geomorphologic history on this dynamic barrier island. Sandy Hook grew northward from the 16<sup>th</sup> through the 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. In 1764, the tip of the Hook was only 500 feet north of the lighthouse. By this time, local Native Americans left the area and headed west. Land was continually deposited to the north of lighthouse, but since the Native Americans were gone, it is highly unlikely that any sites associated with them would be present to the north of the lighthouse in post-1764 deposits.

The second factor affecting archeological resources is the extensive earth moving operations which changed rolling sand dunes into the existing level areas. The Sandy Hook Proving Ground and Fort Hancock are located in these level areas. Previous earth moving and construction activities undertaken by the military in the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries created the facilities that are now part of the historic district. Those activities caused extensive ground disturbance and damage to or burial of earlier historic and prehistoric sites. The effects on early sites ranged from obliteration to simple exposure and minor disturbance, to unintentional covering that now protects previous sites.

Archeological evidence of the military activities conducted since the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century are to be found virtually everywhere within the core leasing area. These include building foundations, privy and cistern pits, trash deposits, railroad beds, utility trenches, fence lines and walks, landscape plantings, the ground contour and the very topsoil on the site today. Although some archeological evidence from the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century has been examined (e.g. foundations of 20<sup>th</sup> century structures removed by the military in their last years or more recently by the NPS), other evidence awaits fuller research.

Traces of earlier sites also lie within the Landmark District. Many represent activities quite different from those reflected in the National Register nominations. The most intact remains found to date are those from the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century associated with the Sandy Hook Lighthouse. These include foundations and middens that reflect the traditional use of the lighthouse, the domestic activities of the operators and their families and military occupations during the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812. Artifacts have been found of two prehistoric sites and sites associated with military occupation during the War of 1812 in other areas of the park. No other intact early sites have been found within the core project area. However, sites might be found with associations to Native American land use (not much north of the Lighthouse); shipwrecks (buried and near and below sea level); additional early Lighthouse and life-saving operations (including burials); and military occupation by the British during the

Revolutionary War. Small site discoveries might relate to privateers, fisherman, travelers, and others.

Various artifacts reflect historic experiments and practices at the Sandy Hook Proving Ground and the defensive works erected on Sandy Hook. The area's long history as an Army weapons testing site and a coastal defense site resulted in unexploded ordnance (UXO), but the Department of Defense (DOD) has conducted surveys to detect and remove UXO from public areas. Although UXO likely remain on Sandy Hook, all of Fort Hancock and most of the project area lies outside the weapons testing zone. The discovery of other resources is not expected.

### **3. Description of Affected Properties**

The area of potential effect includes 36 buildings at Fort Hancock, the circulation to and around them, and the cultural landscapes in the vicinity. The approximate area is shown on a map (Figure 8: Buildings in Rehabilitation Alternative). The area is less than one percent of the national park.

As specific plans are developed for each structure, the NPS will consult with the SHPO and the ACHP on the area of potential effects for each project. This will include areas that adjacent to the resources and service areas such as staging areas and storage of materials.

#### ***Buildings***

Thirty-three (33) of the thirty-six (36) buildings identified for adaptive use are located in the Fort Hancock zone of the historic district. With a few exceptions, the buildings were constructed in the Colonial Revival style of buff colored brick finish with white mortar joints. Most of these buildings date from 1898 through 1910 and were designed to meet a variety of needs including housing, military administration, supply storage and recreation.

The newest structures, including the Chapel, were constructed at Fort Hancock by 1941 in preparation for World War II. The Chapel has been extensively altered, and many of its character-defining features are missing. The building has no steeple, the exterior walls are covered in asbestos siding, and asbestos shingles replaced the original roof.

The NPS conducted an environmental assessment of the proposal for NEPA and NHPA purposes, and the document includes: the name, number, date of construction, a brief description of the buildings, and a list of the character defining features. The list of character defining features are drawn from a study called the *Fort Hancock Rehabilitation Guidelines*, prepared in March 1999 by the NPS and jointly amended with the New Jersey State Historic Preservation Office during a site visit in January of 2001.

Most of the Fort Hancock buildings retain their original fabric and character defining features. Minor alterations have included:

- replacement of the original slate roofs with asbestos shingles
- the addition of garages to most Officers Row houses around 1941
- enclosure of some porches on the residential buildings, illustrated by Building 21, a two-family house for Officers
- small additions to the bakery buildings, the gas station, and other buildings.

Three other buildings built prior to 1919 within the Proving Ground zone are proposed for adaptive use. These red brick structures sharply contrast with the yellow brick Colonial Revival style buildings of Fort Hancock. The oldest of these structures is the Second-Empire style Officers' Quarters (Building 114), which was painted yellow when it became the Fort Hancock Officers' Club. In addition to the color change, the Officers' Club has undergone the greatest number of alterations. These alterations include the removal of a porch and the construction of four additions, several of which are stylistically incompatible with the original Second-Empire style of the building. Despite these changes, the Officers' Club retains individual integrity, and contributes to the overall integrity of the District.

Two red brick warehouses of the Proving Ground (Buildings 124 and 125) have been slightly altered since the end of the period of significance. While they are in need of extensive repair, the windows are in place and the original forms are intact. In some locations, tracks from the early railroad system remain.

### ***Cultural Landscape***

The long history of military association and maritime use has created a highly evolved cultural landscape over most of the Sandy Hook peninsula. Character-defining vegetation features identified in the *Fort Hancock Rehabilitation Guidelines* (1999) include over 100 historic shade trees along road edges, foundation plantings and personalized garden spaces within four feet of the buildings. Historic views and vistas frame the Parade Ground, the Athletic Field, and the Sandy Hook Bay. Manmade landscape features include streetlights, bollards, signs, utility boxes, and walkways of bluestone, red brick, and concrete.

### ***Archeology***

Buried resources may exist within the area of potential effect and may be disturbed during construction activities. Archeologists will conduct testing and recording as needed, and will monitor the construction work as it proceeds.

## **4. Potential Effects on Historic Properties**

### ***Rehabilitation of Historic Properties***

The NPS proposes to implement a leasing program that will lead to the rehabilitation and preservation of 36 buildings. According to the NPS leasing policy, the work must meet the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. This process will result in the preservation of these buildings and grounds through adaptive use. The project may also make use of federal tax credits, further linking the work to the Standards. The work will reverse the existing conditions wherein the buildings have stood vacant in the weather for nearly twenty five years. The project should be a good illustration of the "Preserve America" initiative which encourages public and private partnerships to achieve the preservation of historic resources.

The work on the buildings will meet the following parameters to ensure their integrity. The rehabilitation work will comply with the Secretary's Standards. Professional archeologists will test and record areas to be disturbed, will assess the effects of the proposed work, and will

monitor all ground disturbing activities. The work will create universal access to the first floor of all buildings. In most locations, access will be provided at grade or through the installation of code compliant accessible lifts or other means. All project buildings will be upgraded to comply with current building codes in accordance with 40 USC Section 619. These include National Electric, Plumbing and National Fire Protection Association Codes and the New Jersey Rehabilitation Sub-code; and, all hazardous materials including lead paint and asbestos will be remediated in accordance with applicable codes and regulations.

Extant exterior and interior character-defining features will be preserved to the greatest degree possible and be informed by the “Fort Hancock Rehabilitation Guidelines,” finalized in consultation with staff from the NJSHPO. In general, the exterior character-defining features include masonry details and wood trim, decorative cornices, built-in gutters, doors, porches and windows (installation of interior storm windows). Interior details include original floor plans, millwork, cabinetry, doors, pressed-tin ceilings, and fireplace surrounds. All character-defining features will be repaired; if the feature has deteriorated beyond repair, it would be replaced in kind.

The rehabilitation of the Post Chapel, Building 35, will include reconstruction of the steeple according to documentation in the NPS collection. The rehabilitation will include new utilities within the building such as concealed electricity, telecommunications, plumbing and HVAC systems. All fabric would be repaired where possible, and replaced in kind where necessary.

## **5. Future Actions to Avoid, Minimize or Mitigate Adverse Effects**

In the planning for any rehabilitation project, it is necessary to plan, design, and consider alternatives for each property within the scope of work. The NPS completed an environmental assessment, per the National Environmental Policy Act, which generally outlined the proposed work. Detailed design will take place in the next stage of planning for the rehabilitation. The park has discussed the options with NJSHPO staff over the last several years, and has presented general concepts in public meetings.

The park will be continuing its consultations with the SHPO and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. Proposals for the work will require considerable consultation regarding the details that will protect the integrity of the buildings and their settings within the NHL historic district. Per 36 CFR Part 800, the park has drafted a Programmatic Agreement (PA) to outline future consultations and points of discussion on this project with the NJSHPO and the Advisory Council (draft enclosed). The park will also consult with Consulting Parties who have a deep interest in the outcome of the various rehabilitation projects. The Lessee also will sign the PA as evidence of their commitment to historic preservation and oversight by the NPS.

In addition to executing a PA with the NJSHPO and the Council, the lease agreement between the NPS and its partners in the rehabilitation will reiterate explicit and extensive provisions to assure that potential adverse effects within the historic district are avoided, minimized or mitigated. These provisions apply to all aspects of the lease and will remain in force throughout the long tenure of the lease.

The following are specific provisions of the lease:

- The lessee is required to design and implement all repairs, improvements, alterations, replacements, and all other construction in accordance with the Treatment Standards set forth in Exhibit B of the lease. The Treatment Standards state that the leased buildings must be rehabilitated and maintained in accordance with the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation (36 CFR Part 67.7) and Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties 36 CFR Part 68), with NPS policy, and the Fort Hancock Rehabilitation Guidelines. The PA and the Treatment Standards reflect legal compliance requirements pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Periodic consultation on national historic landmarks with the Park, the State Historic Preservation Office, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation will be timely as needed. The lessee must submit a Preservation Maintenance Plan to the NPS for written approval for each building within the scope of work, adhere to the Plan, and seek written NPS approval of all proposed transfers and sub-leases.
- The NPS must approve in writing all lessee improvements, repairs, replacements, alterations, construction, and installation of any equipment or other features on the interior and exterior of the premises. The NPS must approve all design and construction documents in writing.
- NPS reviews and written approvals are required prior to the commencement of any improvement by lessee.
- All changes in use must be approved in writing by the NPS to determine their consistency with the area's General Management Plan, the PA, and all applicable laws. Any proposed changes shall not have an adverse effect on the mission, resources, or administration of the Sandy Hook Unit of the NPS.
- The NPS must approve the hours of operation of the premises and the lessee is required to submit and annually update a Business and Operating Plan.
- The lease is subject to all applicable laws and provides for the NPS' right to enter any premises for the purpose of inspection and inventory to protect NPS interests and its historic properties.
- The NPS has the right to use the exterior of the premises for all approved and customary NPS public interpretative activities.
- Two of the leased buildings, the Post Theater and Post Chapel will be rehabilitated by the lease partners but will be used on a shared use basis for NPS public programs and activities.
- The use of the premises both authorized and required, are specifically defined in the lease. For example, educational uses shall comprise at least 30% of the premises.

## **6. Views Provided by Consulting Parties and the Public**

Starting in February 2002, the Park has held a total of seven public meetings or open houses regarding the Fort Hancock Rehabilitation Project. Approximately 1500 people attended these meetings and provided verbal and written comments on the proposed rehabilitation of these NHL properties.

The project has been widely covered in local, regional and national media, including numerous articles, letters and editorials. Park staff and representatives of Sandy Hook Partners have provided presentations to public officials, local governing bodies, and various civic organizations and given numerous press and television interviews.



The project is in compliance with all legal, regulatory and NPS policies including the National Environmental Policy Act.

The NPS provided press releases on all aspects of the project and widely distributed project information to local libraries, at public meetings and posted information on the park and partners' web sites. The Environmental Assessment (EA), Analysis of Public Comments on the EA, twenty-two (22) proposals, the draft lease, two (2) Traffic Studies, the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and the draft Programmatic Agreement (PA) were made available to the public.

One hundred and seventy three (173) original letters were received on the Fort Hancock EA. Of those comments:

- 72 or 42% support the project as presented in the EA;
- 32 or 18% support the project but expressed concerns about the plan;
- 20 or 12% oppose the plan for rehabilitation and adaptive use;
- 31 or 18% expressed concerns without stating support or opposition; and
- 18 or 10% expressed no opinion (e.g. asked to be added to mailing list).

The park received two (2) petitions with 201 and 158 signatures. Both petitions specifically oppose "commercialization" of the park.

Two (2) sets of form letters were received with 85 signers endorsing the plan and thirteen (13) signers questioning the impact of relocated parking areas and additional visitors on wildlife habitat.

Public meetings were held with the first on April 20, 2002, where 44 individuals spoke. Of those speakers:

- 21 or 48% support the project as presented in the EA;
- 14 or 32% support the project but expressed concerns about the plan;
- 6 or 14% oppose the plan for rehabilitation and adaptive use; and
- 3 or 7% expressed interest/concerns without stating support or opposition.

Twenty-six (26) individuals spoke at the second public meeting held on June 1, 2002. Of those speakers:

- 6 or 23% support the project as presented in the EA;
- 17 or 65% support the project but expressed concern about the plan;
- 3 or 12% oppose the plan for rehabilitation and adaptive use; and
- 0 or 0% expressed interest/concerns without stating support or opposition.

The NPS received approximately 22 written comments from public officials and groups. By a wide margin, these letters supported the NPS proposed action. The following endorsed the proposed action and the use of public/private partnership: The State of New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP); the National Trust for Historic Preservation; Preservation New Jersey, Inc.; Rutgers the State University of New Jersey- Institute of Marine and Coastal Studies; the University of Pennsylvania/Wharton School, Sol C. Snyder Entrepreneurial Center; the Monmouth County Planning Board; Northern Monmouth Chamber of Commerce; the Township of Middletown Environmental Commission; and, the Township of Middletown Landmarks Commission.

The National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) and New Jersey Senator Joseph M. Kyrillos, Jr. wrote in support of the proposed rehabilitation. The Sierra Club agreed that the Fort Hancock buildings were deserving of rehabilitation but opposed privatization and the American Littoral Society (ALS) recognized that with no federal funding available, the adaptive use plan may be the last chance to save a Sandy Hook resource for which the Society possesses “a great affection.”

The Two Rivers Council of Mayors and the Bayshore Council of Mayors represent all of the park’s neighboring communities in Northern Monmouth County. Each voted to endorse the Fort Hancock adaptive reuse plan.

The American Littoral Society and Preservation New Jersey, Inc. also noted that the proposed plan could be implemented without infringing upon or impacting natural resources. The comments from Rutgers University recognized that the many unique habitats of Sandy Hook, set next to one of the busiest harbors in the world, combine in a fantastic real-world laboratory of enormous significance. They believe that if rehabilitated, Fort Hancock and Proving Ground buildings could become a world-class education and research center. The National Atmospheric and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, and James J. Howard Marine Sciences Laboratory (at Sandy Hook) also wrote in support of initiatives which are conducive to active marine research and education in fisheries, marine, and environmental sciences.

The NJDEP, (SHPO), in its comments, recognized that the NPS has stressed throughout the public process that people living and working in the buildings is an essential link to the efficient preservation of the buildings. Also they noted that the ongoing use of the buildings creates an immediate need to make repairs, rather than deferring them to a long list of maintenance needs. As a result, small problems are fixed before they become big problems.

Many written comments recognized a related matter: in order to generate revenue to care for the buildings over the life of the lease, the leasing effort has to be economically viable.

The NPS initiated a supplemental Traffic Impact Study on November 1, 2002. The study titled “Gateway Village Rehabilitation Project – Fort Hancock and the Sandy Hook Proving Ground – Monmouth County, NJ” was released for public review on March 13, 2003 and comments closed on April 30, 2003. A public meeting was held on April 12, 2003 where twenty-four (24) individuals spoke:

- 15 or 62% support the project as presented in the EA;
- 3 or 12% support the project but expressed concerns about the plan;
- 6 or 25% oppose the plan for rehabilitation and adaptive use; and
- 0 or 0% expressed interest/concerns without stating support or opposition.

Twenty (20) original letters were received during the supplemental comment period:

- 6 or 30% support the project as presented in the EA;
- 11 or 55% support the project but expressed concerns about the plan;
- 3 or 15% oppose the plan for rehabilitation and adaptive use; and
- 0 or 0% expressed interest/concern without stating support or opposition.

The phase of comments generally reflected the comments received during the previous comment period. The scope of the Traffic Impact Study was criticized as being too narrow and for not analyzing enough intersections at a sufficient distance from the park.

A public forum was held by Congressman Frank Pallone on September 18, 2004. Approximately one hundred and twenty-five (125) people attended and thirty six people spoke at the public forum.

Various letters received during public comment periods are included as an attachment to this report.

### ***Consultation and Coordination***

The following agencies were contacted and/or consulted during preparation of the EA:

**U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, New Jersey Field Office (USFWS):** The NPS informally consulted the Endangered Species Division (Annette Scherer) on endangered and threatened species, and the Wetlands Branch (Tom McDowell) on wetland issues. On April 11, 2000, sent a letter specifying that piping plovers are the only species of federal concern in the project area and they described methods to ensure that the proposed action is not likely to adversely affect that species. The NPS obtained additional information concerning endangered species in the project area from the USFWS' Internet site at <http://endangered.fws.gov/statlr5.html> and a variety of other Internet sites, including sites posted by the USFWS, U.S. Geological Survey's Biological Resources Division, and the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP). The NPS submitted a copy of this EA to the USFWS and requested concurrence with the NPS' determination that the proposed action is not likely to adversely affect the piping plover. Section 7 reviews were completed on May 14, 2003.

**New Jersey Office of Historic Preservation (NJSHPO):** The NPS met with representatives from NJSHPO (Dan Saunders and Kurt Leisure) on two separate occasions. The first meeting, held in December of 2000 at NPS offices at Sandy Hook, introduced the Rehabilitation Alternative to NJSHPO. At the request of NJSHPO, a second meeting was held on January 8 and 9, 2001 that took the form of a walk-through of the existing buildings, and around the cultural landscape. *The Fort Hancock Rehabilitation Guidelines* list of character-defining features for each building was reviewed and mutually amended.

**Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP):** The NPS informally contacted the ACHP to introduce the Rehabilitation Alternative to the Council. A representative of the Council, Martha Catlin, participated on the site visit with the NJSHPO staff on January 8 and 9, 2001.

**New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, Division of Water Quality, Bureau of Point Source (NJDEP/DWQ):** The NPS contacted the NJDEP Bureau of Point Source Permitting (Jim Grob) concerning the use of treated water to irrigate turf in the area. The NJDEP representative noted that they are encouraging such use under appropriate circumstances. NJDEP representative sent NPS a document titled "Technical Manual for Reclaimed Water for Beneficial Reuse." Information regarding best management practices for storm water runoff was obtained from the NJDEP website.

**New Jersey Division of Fish, Game, and Wildlife (NJDFGW):** The NPS contacted the Endangered and Non-game Species Program (Dave Jenkins) on endangered and threatened

species issues of concern to the state. According to their representative, the only species of state concern in the project area are the threatened osprey and endangered piping plover. In addition, the NJDFGW suggested methods to ensure the proposed action is not likely to adversely affect osprey. The NPS submitted a copy of this EA to the NJDFGW for review and comment. Conservation measures recommended by the NJDFGW were incorporated into the park osprey management plan.

## **7. Programmatic Agreement**

The NPS plans to implement this proposal so that the results will have no adverse effects on the qualities that led to listing the Fort Hancock Historic District as an NHL. In a good faith effort to outline ongoing planning and design consultations with the NJSHPO and the ACHP, the NJSHPO and the park drafted the enclosed PA to outline future procedures and milestones. The NPS will also work with the lessee on measures that will avoid, minimize or mitigate potential adverse effects to historic structures.

The PA outlines professional practices to be executed by the NPS and all partners in the proposed rehabilitation:

- Lessee will engage a qualified project manager and an archeologist meeting Secretary of Interior professional qualifications standards.
- Lessee will provide a written plan for implementation of rehabilitation of leased historic buildings.
- NPS to halt work on the site if any activity conflicts with the Secretary's Standards.
- PA provides specific provisions for consultation with SHPO on design and specifications.
- Detailed stipulations on "approvals and documentation provisions."
- Comprehensive stipulations on archeological sites.
- Reporting and review requirements among all signatories to the agreement.
- Provisions made for resolving objections.

### ***Summary of Public Comments***

The NJSHPO and the park drafted a Programmatic Agreement (Agreement) regarding consultation and future rehabilitation of portions of Fort Hancock and the Sandy Hook Proving Ground National Historic Landmark District, Sandy Hook, New Jersey, and released it for public comment. The Agreement is to be executed by the National Park Service, the New Jersey Historic Preservation Office, Sandy Hook Partners, and The Advisory Council in Historic Preservation.

The NPS issued a News Release on April 30, 2004 soliciting public comments on the Agreement. The Agreement was posted on line at the NPS Planning, Environment and Public Comment (PEPC) web site and the NPS Gateway National Recreation Area web

site. Printed copies were available at local area libraries in Monmouth County and at the Sandy Hook Visitor Center and Park Headquarters.

Comments on the Agreement were accepted either on line (PEPC) or in writing through June 3, 2004.

## SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS ON PROPOSED PA

- One Letter
  - 1) Agreement is premature and deficient.
  - 2) Decision to award lease has not complied with conditions set forth in Section 106.
  - 3) Procedures and application for the historic lease at Fort Hancock are flawed and tainted.
- Two Emails
  - 1) Supports the effort – buildings valuable for interpretative of the history of Sandy Hook – a public/private partnership is the only realistic agent to successfully address this project.
  - 2) Why “Save Sandy Hook” opposes NPS commercial plan for Fort Hancock.
- Five Comments received through PEPC internet site
  - 1) Great concern that the Sandy Hook leasing project will further mitigate the need for the sandy slurry pipeline being placed adjacent to Lot C (from surfer).
  - 2) Concern for protection of archeological resources and monitoring during construction activities – need for archeological data recovery plan and concern for prohibitive cost – disappointed in ACHP policy statement.
  - 3) Questioned the legality of signing the PA without a signed lease – reconciliation of discrepancies between the lease and PA.
  - 4) Why are comments required before a lease has been signed - ability to terminate for any reason – stated experience with government terminating contracts – failure to provide Order of Precedence clause in lease and resolution of conflicts – lease term years required for utilization of Historic Tax Credits.
  - 5) Comments on behalf of Middletown Landmarks Commission –

Supports the preservation of Fort Hancock – SHP is equipped to follow the guidelines and regulations.



## **CASE REPORT**

### **Appendices**

---

- **Fort Hancock – Site Plan and Aerial Photograph  
Existing Conditions - 2004**
- **National Register Nomination**
- **Buildings to be Rehabilitated  
Site Plan and Inventory of Buildings**
- **Summary of NJSHPO Consultation/Coordination**
- **Programmatic Agreement – Draft and  
Documentation of Public Process**

**The following are available at the Gateway National Recreation Area web site under  
Management Documents:**

**[www.nps.gov/gate](http://www.nps.gov/gate)**

**Fort Hancock Environmental Assessment  
Document Type: PDF**

**Fort Hancock FONSI  
Document Type: PDF**

**Fort Hancock Proposed Draft Programmatic Agreement (PA)  
Document Type: PDF**

**Fort Hancock Public Meeting April 20, 2002  
Document Type: PDF**

**Fort Hancock Public Meeting June 1, 2002  
Document Type: PDF**

**Fort Hancock Public Meeting April 12, 2003  
Document Type: PDF**

**Fort Hancock Rehabilitation Guidelines  
Document Type: PDF**